

MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)
United States Attorney

MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
Criminal Chief

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5061
FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CR 11-00456 EJD
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
v.)	ORDER CONTINUING STATUS
)	HEARING AND EXCLUDING TIME
SANFORD WALLACE,)	UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
)	
Defendant.)	
)	SAN JOSE VENUE

The undersigned parties respectfully request that the status hearing currently scheduled for August 6, 2012 be continued to October 1, 2012. The reason for the continuance is that K.C. Maxwell, who represents the defendant, is continuing her investigation. In addition, the parties need to meet and confer about the case. The parties also request an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from August 6, 2012 through October 1, 2012. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

//

//

1 SO STIPULATED:

MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

2
3 DATED: 7/30/12

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

4
5 DATED: 7/30/12

/s/
K.C. MAXWELL
Counsel for Mr. Wallace

6
7
8 **ORDER**

9 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the status hearing
10 scheduled for August 6, 2012 is continued to October 1, 2012.

11 The Court FURTHER ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from
12 August 6, 2012 through October 1, 2012. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons,
13 that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of
14 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance
15 would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
16 account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court
17 therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A)
18 and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20
21 DATED: July 30, 2012


EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge